IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

TUESDAY, THE THIRD DAY OF MAY
TWO THOUSAND AND FIVE

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE GODA RAGHURAM

WRIT PETITION NO.10883 of 2005

Between:

Smt. R. Ramulamma W/o.Challa Gopal
R/o.Malkapuram Village Dharmavaram Mandal, Ananthapur District.

..... PETITIONER

AND

1 The Joint Collector, Ananthapur, Ananthapur District.
2 The Revenue Divisional Officer Dharmavaram Mandal, Ananthapur

District.
3 The Mandal Revenue Officer Dharmavaram Mandal, Ananthapur

District.

....RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed herein the High Court may be pleased to call for records and issue a writ, order or direction more particularly one in the nature of writ of Certiorari, against the orders of 1st respondent dt.29.4.2005 in R.C.K4/DMV/1373/2004 as being arbitrary, illegal without jurisdiction and in violation of principles of natural justice and consequently quash the same.

Counsel for the Petitioner: Mr. C.KODANDA RAM

Counsel for the Respondents: GP FOR REVENUE

The Court, at the admission stage, made the following:

-

-

-

ORAL ORDER:

The petitioner's authorization to run a Fair Price Shop in Malkapuram village, Dharmavaram Mandal, Anahthapur District was suspended by the 2nd respondent by proceedings dated 18.11.2004 pending enquiry. Aggrieved thereby, the petitioner preferred an appeal to the 1st respondent. The 1st respondent rejected the appeal by order dated 29.04.2005 and directed the 2nd respondent to expeditiously conclude the disciplinary proceedings against the petitioner. As against the order of the 1st respondent, the petitioner states that he has filed a revision before the District Collector, Ananthapur and this writ petition is filed alleging that the order of the 1st respondent dated 29.04.2005 in "remanding the appeal to the 2nd respondent" is arbitrary and illegal.

In fact, by the impugned order, the 1st respondent has not remanded the appeal. The appeal has been dismissed. The appeal was directed against the order of the 2nd respondent suspending the petitioner's authorization. The 1st respondent directed the

2nd respondent to expeditiously conclude the substantive disciplinary proceedings against the petitioner. As against the orders of the

1st respondent dismissing the appeal, preferred against the orders of the 2nd respondent, the petitioner has already preferred an appeal to the District Collector, Ananthapur.

In the circumstances, there is nothing substantive for this Court to interdict in judicial review. The Writ petition is misconceived and is accordingly dismissed.

_____

GODA RAGHURAM, J.

Date: 03.05.2005

Nsr/Svv

..... REGISTRAR

// TRUE COPY //

SECTION OFFICER

To

1 The Joint Collector, Ananthapur, Ananthapur District.
2 The Revenue Divisional Officer Dharmavaram Mandal, Ananthapur

District.
3 The Mandal Revenue Officer Dharmavaram Mandal, Ananthapur

District.

4 Two CCs to GP for Revenue, High Court Buildings, Hyderabad (OUT)

5 Two CD copies